

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#251: Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project**

Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Initial Selection Panel Review**

**Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding</b> | #1 |
|   | #2 |
|   | #3 |

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Initial Selection Panel Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

**Proposal Number:** 251

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

#### Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

**Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan** (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

**Not Recommended** (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

#### Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

| Fund                        |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| As Is                       | - |
| In Part                     | - |
| With Conditions             | - |
| Consider as Directed Action | - |
| Not Recommended             | X |

Amount:    **\$0**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**This proposal would initiate a series of fish passage and screening projects on Cow Creek, a tributary to the Sacramento River. The proposal was rated high by the Regional Panel and above average by the technical review panel. Despite these ratings, the Selection Panel does not recommend initiation of these kinds of efforts on Cow Creek at this time. The panel notes that Cow Creek was not identified as a priority watershed in the PSP, that screening diversions on Cow Creek were not identified in the list of priority screening projects included in the PSP, and that Cow Creek is not a watershed where the ERP has invested substantial funds in the past. The Selection Panel does not recommend funding this proposal at this time, given that a number of previously identified priorities are likely to go unfunded in the near future due to insufficient funds.**

## Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

**Proposal Number:** 251

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

**Review:**

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

**Above Average:** Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Adequate:** No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Not Recommended:** Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

| Overall Evaluation Summary Rating | Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating  |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| -Superior                         | See response to 6. and the miscellaneous comments Rated as above average only because of its relatively smaller size compared to other projects in the Sacramento region. |
| XAbove average                    |   |
| -Adequate                         |   |
| -Not recommended                  |   |

1. **Location in terms of potential impact on fishery.** Is the project located where it will significantly benefit the fishery? Do current fish passage barriers or water diversions there harm large numbers of fish? What species of anadromous fish are present? Is the project located where these species are in their most vulnerable life stages? Will it benefit other species of fish or the waterway's community and ecosystem? Does it restore and protect natural habitats or habitat values? Will its benefits be long-term, or short-lived? Is its biological effectiveness clearly demonstrable?

The project would have significant benefits to fisheries. A demonstration project would help provide upstream passage of Central Valley steelhead and fall-run Chinook to upstream natural barriers. The feasibility study of the five additional screen and ladder projects on Cow Creek would lead towards future implementation of those facilities, thereby reducing the identified major fish passage and entrainment structures on the creek. Seasonal dam construction may, however, be more appropriate.

2. **Diversions taking a greater proportion of flow.** If the project is a fish screen, is the size of the diversion to be screened a significant proportion of the waterway's discharge?

**The diversion is for 4.6 cfs, which could be a significant proportion of Cow Creek in summer months.**

3. **Implementability** (minimal legal, regulatory or technical obstacles): Does the project use proven and existing technology, or unproven and experimental technology? Can it be implemented in a timely fashion, or are protracted delays anticipated? Are project partners, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Will legal, regulatory, or technical obstacles impede it? Can any adverse effects be reversed or adequately mitigated? Does it enjoy public support? Is it compatible with other programs and projects, which are part of an integrated restoration program for the waterway? Does it have synergistic effects with ongoing programs?

**The project is highly implementable. The project has regulatory agency and landowner support. The project is compatible with CALFED ERP and CVPIA programs and goals for fisheries restoration. The demonstration project would use, or build off, proven technology. No major obstacles anticipated in conducting a feasibility study.**

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**Yes**

5. **Partnerships/Opportunities.** Does the project fully involve appropriate partners? Are the applicants willing participants? Are other cost-sharing funds available, and fully exploited?

**Applicant is a willing participant. They have received CALFED, CVPIA, DFG and private interests cost share funding for other elements of the project. Applicant is now requesting CALFED funds for the feasibility studies and the demonstration project.**

6. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

**The regional panel gave this proposal a High ranking. The project is likely to be feasible and is consistent with other restoration activities in the region. This creek could yield significant fisheries benefits with the proposed restoration activities. It also has high local and agency involvement.**

7. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

**No**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**We agree with the regional panels ranking of the project. The demonstration project's fish screen construction should be implemented now. The feasibility study of the five additional screen and ladder projects should also proceed. The review panel believes that this project, if chosen for funding, could be funded for the demonstration fish screen at roughly \$50,000 to \$100,000, and the feasibility study at roughly \$112,000.**

**Construction of the demonstration project's fishway should be deferred until the feasibility study is complete. A seasonal removable fishway for use when the flashboards are up may be more cost effective than the fishway now proposed. The concept for the seasonal removable fishway at the flashboard dams could be evaluated in the feasibility study.**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 251

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

Overall Ranking:    -Low    -Medium    **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**After drafting the Cow Ck Watershed Assessment, which identified the need for fish screens/ladders, then prioritizing these projects and working to attain permission/involvement from landowners, this well written, well thought-out proposal has been submitted. Basically this proposal calls for developing feasibility studies for screens at 4 of the high priority sites and constructing one demonstration screen. This proposal reflects stakeholder supported resource management/planning and proactive efforts by the people involved in the Cow Creek watershed group and technical team.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Landowners have been involved in developing this proposal and their permission is clearly supported as evidenced by their letters of support/permission. All diversions in the Cow Creek watershed have been prioritized and ranked by the amount of water diverted; the proposal reflects the need to screen the highest priority sites. Resource agencies will be providing technical guidance.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Page 11 of the proposal details the applicability of this project to CALFED/CVPIA goals. In terms of priorities, this proposal addresses the priority to work with local groups, address habitat limiting issues, construct fish screens, assist at-risk species, rehabilitating ecosystem processes, assisting harvestable species and providing passage to upstream habitat.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**This project is closely tied to the people and agencies working within the Cow Ck watershed. The proposed activities are described in the recently drafted Watershed Assessment for this area and is closely guided by the local resource conservation district.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

☒Yes -No

How?

**Attendance at the local watershed meetings is consistently very high, reflecting a continued high level of involvement by local people and institutions. Since this group's inception in 1999, they have demonstrated a high level of motivation. The technical committee consists of representatives from many of the appropriate resource agencies.**

Other Comments:

**This proposal is important to fund this year.**



## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1**

**New Proposal Number:** 251

**New Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**99-N16, A Clear Creek Prescription, ERP.**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**N/A**

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

**XYes -No -N/A**

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2**

**New Proposal Number:** 251

**New Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**98- F15, Lower Clear Creek Floodway Restoration Project, Phase II, CALFED ERP**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**Cooperator submits timely and accurate quarterly reports and is very responsive to Project Officer inquiries.**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3**

**New Proposal Number:** 251

**New Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**AFRP: Battle Creek Your Watershed at Work FY 2000 and Battle Ck Watershed Strategy (1448-11330-97-JO75, #30-1A)**

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No ☒N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 251

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**May need grading permits.**

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

**Budget detail does not indicate whether "permitting" includes the cost of preparing CEQA documents as well as obtaining necessary permits. Unable to determine if amount is adequate.**

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

**If necessary permits are obtained, and budget is adequate, this project is feasible.**

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 251

**Applicant Organization:** Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

**Proposal Title:** Cow Creek Fish Passage and Fish Screening Project

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

**difference of \$127,982 from grand total**

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No



If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

**all information well defined in budget summary and justification.**